

[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:22-03047-YGR

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

**AGENDA AND JOINT STATEMENT FOR
DECEMBER 13, 2023, CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

Pursuant to Case Management Order No. 1 (ECF 75) and Case Management Order No. 6 (ECF 451), the Parties submit this agenda and joint statement in advance of the December 13, 2023, Case Management Conference (“CMC”).

I. Status of Individual Plaintiffs’ Personal Injury Claims

Plaintiffs’ Position:

Plaintiffs reviewed the Court’s Order on the first set of motions to dismiss and intend to withdraw Claims 6 (Negligent Undertaking), 13 (Violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(f), and 1446A), and 15 (Violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252B and 2258A) as to all Defendants, and Claims 12 (Violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2255 and 2252) and 14 (Violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2255 and 2252A(5)(b)) as to all Defendants other than the Meta Defendants, provided that (a) this withdrawal is without prejudice; and (b) plaintiffs who have alleged these claims in their short

form complaints are provided a reasonable opportunity to amend their complaints to continue asserting these counts should they wish to do so.¹ Withdrawal in this manner is consistent with the Short Form Complaint (“SFC”) process, which expressly provides that individual plaintiffs may include in their SFCs claims and additional allegations that are not asserted in the Master Complaint. *See* SFC Implementation Order, Ex. A at 1 (ECF 177) (plaintiffs may include “additional Causes of Action and supporting allegations against Defendants, as set forth in paragraph 11 in additional sheets attached hereto”). Withdrawal in this manner also is appropriate because withdrawal of such claims with prejudice would require consent from each existing MDL Plaintiff that asserts such claims and any withdrawal with prejudice could not bind any future plaintiffs who file SFCs in the MDL.

Defendants’ Position:

Defendants agree with Plaintiffs that Counts 6, 12, 13, 14, and 15 should be withdrawn, but withdrawal should be with prejudice. Plaintiffs’ proposal to permit individual plaintiffs to simply re-assert the same claims in their Short-Form Complaints is inefficient and, particularly for the federal claims (Counts 12-15), may necessitate essentially identical motion to dismiss briefing at a different juncture. Further, the same authorities that warrant dismissal of Count 13 as to all Defendants, *see, e.g., Doe #1 v. Twitter, Inc.*, 2023 WL 3220912, at *2 (9th Cir. May 3, 2023), warrant dismissing Counts 12 and 14 as to Defendant Meta, *see, e.g., id.*; *see also Zhang v. Twitter Inc.*, 2023 WL 5493823, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2023).

Defendants further note that Plaintiffs first shared their proposal with Defendants on this topic at 7:49 p.m. PT the night before this CMC statement was due (long after the parties’ agreed-to exchange deadline).

II. Outstanding Coordination Order Disputes

Following the November 16, 2023, CMC, the Parties, including the State Attorneys General, met and conferred further in efforts to develop a mutually agreeable coordination order. *See* CMO No. 6 (ECF 451) (ordering parties to further meet and confer). The Parties were unable

¹ Plaintiffs will remove these claims from the pleading at the time they file their amended Master Complaint. *See infra* § VII.

1 to reach agreement. Plaintiffs' revised proposed coordination order, including input from the
 2 State Attorneys General, is attached as **Exhibit A** and Defendants' revised proposed coordination
 3 order is attached as **Exhibit B**.

4 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

5 During the November CMC, Defendants requested further meet and confer to narrow the
 6 Parties' disputes regarding a coordination order, and represented that a sharp pen would be taken
 7 to their previously submitted version. That did not happen. Instead, Defendants have doubled
 8 down, making only superficial revisions to their prior proposal which do not narrow the core
 9 disputes. *See Exhibit C* (redline compare reflecting Defendants' revisions to their prior
 10 proposal). Plaintiffs again reject Defendants' proposed coordination order on the basis that it
 11 creates unworkable procedural hurdles, impedes other courts' authority to manage the cases
 12 before them, and dictates how the plaintiffs in other actions prosecute their cases.

13 **Provisions that create unworkable procedural hurdles for non-duplicative discovery**
 14 **(Defs' Proposed Order ¶¶ 13, 14, 19, 22).** Under Defendants' proposed order, if a Party in a
 15 Coordinated Action wants to propound *non-duplicative* discovery, it must first seek leave in the
 16 Coordinated Action and show (1) that it has reviewed the MDL discovery and determined the
 17 discovery it is seeking is needed for the issues unique to that case; (2) good cause why the
 18 discovery could not be taken in the MDL. *See Ex. B, Defs' Proposed Order ¶ 14.* This provision
 19 goes well beyond coordination because it limits how and when parties in a Coordinated Action
 20 may propound discovery that is not sought in the MDL. It also creates additional burden on the
 21 Coordination Action court to determine if the requesting party has demonstrated *good cause* to
 22 seek *non-duplicative* discovery. Such a requirement is in contravention to our adversarial system,
 23 is unworkable, and would result in delay.

24 Defendants include a similar provision with respect to depositions. *See Ex. B, Defs'*
 25 *Proposed Order ¶ 19.* Specifically, Defendants would require parties in a Coordinated Action to
 26 show good cause to the court presiding over the Coordinated Action why an MDL deponent could
 27 not have been questioned about issues *unique* to the Coordinated Action during the MDL
 28

1 deposition.² Again, restrictions on non-duplicative discovery do not advance coordination or
 2 efficiency, but instead create unnecessary procedural hurdles and prohibit other parties from
 3 prosecuting or defending their cases as they see fit.

4 Defendants' proposal also complicates discovery access by Plaintiffs in the MDL. While
 5 Plaintiffs have no objection to provisions which clarify that plaintiffs in Coordinated Actions
 6 cannot automatically access discovery of MDL Defendants who they have not sued in the
 7 Coordinated Action, paragraphs 13 and 22 of Defendants' proposal would go much further and
 8 forbid Plaintiffs in the MDL from participating in depositions or receiving discovery in a
 9 Coordinated Action except as to a particular Plaintiff who has named the Defendant in the MDL.
 10 But in MDLs, Plaintiffs' leadership do not conduct liability discovery on behalf of any single
 11 Plaintiff, but for the common benefit of all. Defendants' proposed restrictions on who within the
 12 MDL is entitled to what discovery are thus nonsensical.

13 **Provisions that limit other courts' authority (Defs' Proposed Order ¶¶ 10, 11, 13, 25,**
 14 **26, 28, 29, 30).** Under Defendants' proposed order, coordination is not allowed unless the parties
 15 in the Coordination Action execute the Protective Order,³ the 502(d) Order, ESI Protocol, any
 16 preservation order(s), and all other discovery related order entered in the MDL (collectively, the
 17 "MDL Discovery Orders"). *See* Ex. B, Defs' Proposed Order ¶¶ 10, 11; *see also id.* ¶¶ 13, 25, 26
 18 (referencing the MDL Discovery Orders). Plaintiffs are amenable to a requirement that the
 19 parties in a Coordinated Action execute the MDL Protective Order *or* an equivalent protective
 20 order. But as already previewed, Judge Kuhl has indicated that early disclosure of experts is not
 21 allowed under California state law. *See* JCCP Minute Order at 3 (May 3, 2023) (ECF 267-3).
 22 Thus, should Section 7.6 of the Protective Order remain following resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion
 23 for Relief (ECF 303), it is unlikely such a requirement would be required in the JCCP, and thus a
 24 coordination order that requires execution of the MDL Protective Order would not have the
 25

26 ² Plaintiffs do not oppose Defendants' requirement that a "noticing party shall, to the extent
 27 feasible, provide fourteen days' written notice to all counsel in the MDL, JCCP, and other
 28 Coordinated Actions." *Compare* Ex. B, Defs' Proposed Order ¶ 22, *with* Ex. A, Pls' Proposed
 Order ¶ 12.

³ Although Judge Hixson entered a Protective Order in the MDL (ECF 290), Plaintiffs have
 challenged Section 7.6 of the order with respect to early expert disclosures.

1 support of the JCCP court or parties.

2 Likewise, a requirement that coordination would tie the Coordinated Actions to all other
3 discovery-related orders ultimately entered in the MDL would strip away the Coordinated Action
4 court's authority to supervise discovery in its own jurisdiction under its own rules and procedures.
5 Defendants' fear that Plaintiffs will seek multiple bites at the apple in attempts to end-run
6 unfavorable rulings is misplaced and overblown. Plaintiffs have agreed to "coordinate discovery
7 to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, avoid undue burden and expense, and promote the
8 efficient and speedy resolution of the MDL, JCCP, and any other Coordinated Actions." *See* Ex.
9 A, Pls' Proposed Order ¶ 9. Plaintiffs, moreover, are confident that the courts in the Coordinated
10 Actions would quickly stamp out any discovery shenanigans should they arise.

11 Finally, Defendants continue to insist that the plaintiffs in a Coordinated Action present
12 discovery disputes to the MDL Court in the first instance.⁴ *See* Ex. B, Defs' Proposed Order
13 ¶¶ 28-30. As previously argued, that intrudes on the Coordinated Court's authority to hear
14 discovery disputes in its own proceedings, and is arguably beyond the authority of the MDL
15 Court to order. Judge Kuhl, for example, has noted that she intends to "closely supervise
16 discovery" in the JCCP. *See* JCCP Hr'g Tr. at 39:5-6 (Feb. 17, 2023) (ECF 267-6).

17 **Provisions that restrict plaintiffs' ability to prosecute their case (Defs' Proposed**
18 **Order ¶¶ 23).** Although Defendants rescinded their prior provision that the MDL would be
19 deemed the "lead" case—which would prohibit any Coordinated Action from advancing
20 discovery ahead of the MDL or setting a discovery schedule that was more expeditious than that
21 of the MDL—paragraph 23 of Defendants' proposed order in effect does just this. Paragraph 23
22 prohibits depositions of parties in the MDL to be taken in a Coordinated Action without showing
23 good cause, including why the discovery sought cannot be obtained in the MDL. The named
24 defendants in the currently-pending related actions are Parties to this MDL, so under Defendants'
25 proposal, depositions could not be conducted in Coordinated Actions without showing good cause
26 (presumably to the Coordinated Action court).

27
28 ⁴ Under Defendants' proposal, plaintiffs in a Coordinated Action would be permitted to raise
discovery disputes directly with their court only by demonstrating "good cause" (¶ 29).

Paragraph 23 goes further by prohibiting discovery in Coordinated Actions if the MDL Court has ruled that the sought-after discovery is undiscoverable in the MDL. This paragraph severely restricts the ability of the plaintiffs in Coordinated Actions to prosecute their actions based on the claims and defenses in their cases, and would prevent a Coordinated Action from proceeding at its own pace. There are unique issues in the related actions, and there may be reasons why the parties in those cases wish to pursue discovery that has not been allowed in the MDL based on the claims and defenses asserted in each action. And should there be discovery allowed in a Coordinated Action that had not been allowed in the MDL, it is more efficient to address it when and if the situation arises, instead of by an order that restricts discovery from even advancing in a Coordinated Action.⁵

* * *

None of the coordination orders from other MDLs cited by Defendants support an elaborate and overreaching coordination order like the one Defendants propose. They are less restrictive than what Defendants propose here,⁶ most if not all were entered without opposition, and some, like the *Zimmer M/L Taper* MDL order, were largely not entered in any related state court cases (and did not involve a parallel state court consolidated action, like the JCCP here). It bears mentioning that the defendants in *Zimmer M/L Taper* attempted to use the coordination order as a shield from discovery or trial in the related state court actions, which required the MDL Court to issue a clarifying order the coordination order did “not automatically stay state court proceedings or trial” and left scheduling “to the judgement and discretion of the court in that Action”. See **Exhibit D**, Order No. 15 re the Joint Coordination Order, Dkt. 83. Moreover, even in the state court actions that did not formally adopt the coordination order entered in the MDL,

⁵ Similarly, to the extent a party in the Coordinated Action would like to seek discovery from an entity in the MDL that is *not* also named in a Coordinated Action, the parties in the Coordinated Action (in consultation with the entity) can address access to that discovery when and if it arises.

⁶ See, e.g., *In re Acetaminophen – ASD-ADHD Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 1:22-md-03043-DLC, Dkt. 382 at ¶ 9 (S.D.N.Y.) (ECF 267-14) (permitting non-duplicative discovery in non-MDL cases); *In Re: Paraquat Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 3004, Case No. 3:21-md-03004-NJR, Dkt. 462 at ¶ 9 (S.D. Ill. October 26, 2021) (ECF 267-15) (“the parties need not obtain leave of court to conduct non-duplicative discovery”); *In Re: 3M Combat Arms Earplug Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2885, Case No. 3:19-md-02885-MCR-HTC, Dkt. 1162 at ¶ 11 (N.D. Fla. June 3, 2020) (ECF 267-16)(permitting non-duplicative discovery in non-MDL cases).

1 the Parties still successfully informally coordinated discovery to avoid unnecessary duplication.
 2 In short, the coordination order became obsolete, which would likely happen here should the
 3 Court adopt Defendants' proposed order, and unnecessary to facilitate coordination.⁷

4 The purpose of a coordination order is to facilitate efficient discovery and reduce
 5 duplicative efforts and expense across the jurisdictions. Plaintiffs' straightforward proposed
 6 order will advance these goals while providing flexibility when and if nuanced discovery issues
 7 arise.

8 Finally, following consultation with the State Attorneys General, Plaintiffs included a
 9 section to protect counsel communications between Plaintiffs' counsel and Defendants' outside
 10 counsel to facilitate coordination and cooperation between the joint prosecution and defense
 11 teams. Defendants opposed inclusion of such a provision in a coordination order, and thus
 12 Plaintiffs will seek to meet and confer with Defendants to seek an agreement for protected
 13 communication via a separate stipulation, as was accomplished in the *Volkswagen* MDL before
 14 Judge Breyer. *See In re: Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Prod. Litig. Liab.* 3:15-md-02672-CRB,
 15 Dkt. 1326 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2026), *available at*
 16 https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/filelibrary/1720/Pretrial_Order_14.pdf.

17 **States' Position:**

18 The States believe there can be benefits from cooperation in related actions, particularly in
 19 promoting efficiency. Therefore, should this Court decide to issue a coordination order, it should
 20 allow courts and parties to cooperate and coordinate to the extent they consider appropriate.
 21 Plaintiffs' proposed coordination order, which allows, but does not require, coordination on cross-
 22 noticed depositions and the use of discovery material obtained in other cases, permits efficient
 23 sharing of information while preserving sufficient flexibility for courts and parties. Defendants'
 24 proposed order is inappropriate for the reasons outlined by Plaintiffs, including as applied to state
 25 attorney general law enforcement actions pending in state courts.

26 As described by Plaintiffs, the States supported the inclusion of a provision to protect

27 ⁷ Separate and apart from this coordination order subject to entry by courts with a related action,
 28 similar to Judge Kuhl, the Court may also order that discovery requests served and responded to
 in the JCCP will be treated as though served and responded to in the MDL.

counsel communications in the coordination order, and Defendants opposed such inclusion. The States will join with Plaintiffs in seeking to meet and confer with Defendants on a separate stipulation for protected counsel communications.

Defendants' Position:

Consistent with this Court's guidance at the last CMC—and with Judge Kuhl's stated concerns about wanting to "coordinate discovery with the MDL," *e.g.*, Nov. 7, 2023 CMC Tr. 36:5-6⁸—Defendants have streamlined and revised their proposed Coordination Order, attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, down to those essential provisions that would provide parties with access to the same discovery and depositions conducted in the MDL and related actions, while preventing those parties from taking duplicative discovery and re-litigating discovery disputes across the different proceedings. As discussed further below, Defendants' proposed Coordination Order is consistent with coordination orders entered by numerous other MDL courts in similar circumstances. Without this type of standard coordination across related actions, the efficiency benefits that motivated the creation of this MDL will be lost: in addition to the MDL and JCCP proceedings, there are now eleven state AG suits and three related personal injury actions pending in other state courts across the country against the various MDL Defendants. Initial discovery requests have already been served against some of the Defendants in five of those cases, and the private Plaintiffs have informed Defendants that they intend to commence discovery.

All of Plaintiffs' arguments against Defendants' proposed Coordination Order, and particularly their argument that it would "impede[] other courts' authority to manage the cases before them," rest on a fundamental misunderstanding of how Defendants' proposed Coordination Order would actually work and be implemented in related actions. Defendants address those arguments below before presenting the existing precedent supporting entry of their Coordination Order in these proceedings.

How Defendants' Proposed Coordination Order Would Work. Importantly, Defendants' proposed Coordination Order would initially govern only the MDL. Only *after* entry of that

⁸ See also Nov. 7, 2023 CMC Tr. 36:5-6 ("[W]e still don't know how Judge Gonzalez Rogers is going to want to organize discovery and we don't want [discovery] to be repeated [in the JCCP].").

Order by this Court would Defendants then expect to present it to the other courts before which related actions are pending, *and those courts could then choose to enter the Order* to secure its benefits of: (1) streamlining overlapping discovery; (2) preventing unnecessary duplication of pretrial efforts; (3) conserving judicial and party resources; and (4) encouraging coordination among all present and future jurisdictions to ensure efficient litigation and to avoid inconsistent rulings. Defendants' proposed Coordination Order thus allows every court to preserve its own jurisdiction and to control its own docket, while having freedom to make any state-specific adjustments that may be needed.

Because the MDL was formed before the other related actions were filed and is proceeding in federal court, Defendants' proposed Coordination Order envisions that most generally applicable discovery will be conducted here (overseen by Magistrate Judge Kang) and that, for efficiency and consistency, most discovery disputes pertaining to that discovery will be addressed by Judge Kang in the first instance. (Defs. Coordination Order. at ¶ 28). However, contrary to Plaintiffs' assertion, Defendants' proposal accounts for instances where an issue may be uniquely discoverable in a coordinated action based on the claims and defenses asserted. If there is good cause to depart from conducting discovery or addressing disputes in the MDL in the first instance, Defendants' proposal would allow the discovery or dispute to be taken up in the related action in the first instance. (*Id.* at ¶ 29). It would also allow rulings made in the MDL to be revisited in the Coordinated Action "for good cause." (*Id.* ¶ 19).

Benefits of Defendants' Proposed Coordination Order. This centralized approach benefits everyone. For plaintiffs in related actions, it ensures that they are able to immediately access written, document, and deposition discovery taken across proceedings, without having to serve or negotiate new written discovery requests and notices of deposition. For Defendants, it ensures that core discovery takes place in a single forum—without having to negotiate separately in potentially dozens of different proceedings—and that witnesses are generally deposed only once. And for courts, it conserves judicial resources by ensuring that parties do not litigate the same discovery disputes in each proceeding.

Centralizing the discovery forum would not deprive litigants outside this MDL of the

1 ability to take generally applicable discovery. *First*, parties named in related actions are invited
 2 to participate in discovery meet-and-confers. (*Id.* at ¶ 16). *Second*, parties named in related
 3 actions are permitted to participate in any generally applicable depositions. (*Id.* at ¶ 22). *Third*,
 4 parties outside the MDL retain the ability to take non-duplicative generally applicable discovery
 5 (including deposition discovery), where such discovery is necessary to address issues unique to
 6 that related proceeding. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 14, 23). And to address the Court’s concern that counsel in
 7 related actions are fully apprised of what is happening in the MDL, Defendants have committed
 8 in their proposed Coordination Order to keeping plaintiffs in coordinated actions informed about
 9 discovery that has been served in the MDL.⁹

10 ***Existing Precedent for Defendants’ Proposed Coordination Order.*** Coordination Orders
 11 are commonplace in MDLs proceeding in parallel with JCCPs and other related state-court
 12 proceedings, and Defendants’ proposed Coordination Order is consistent with those entered in
 13 other recent MDLs. *See, e.g., In re: Paraquat Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 3004, No. 3:21-md-
 14 3004 (S.D. Ill.) (permitting non-duplicative discovery “relating solely to case-specific issues”); *In*
 15 *re: 3M Combat Arms Earplug Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 2885, No. 3:19-md-2885 (N.D. Fla.)
 16 (requiring parties, before serving discovery in coordinated actions, to “submit requests . . . to
 17 MDL Lead Counsel for inclusion in the requests for documents, interrogatories, depositions on
 18 written questions, and requests for admission to be propounded in the MDL Proceeding”); *In re:*
 19 *Zimmer Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 2859, No. 1:18-md-2859 (S.D.N.Y.).

20 Indeed, Defendants’ Coordination Order tracks many of the same concepts as these prior
 21 orders and, in particular, the recent MDL coordination order entered in *In re: Acetaminophen*
 22 (*APAP*), and in *In re: Zimmer*, including the same or similar provisions for the general application
 23 of coordinated discovery. *See In re: Acetaminophen*, MDL No. 3042, No. 1:22-md-3043, Dkt.
 24 No. 382 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 27, 2023) (“Order: Discovery Coordination”) (for example, allowing non-
 25

26 ⁹ Defendants’ proposed Coordination Order also ensures that in the event that a Plaintiff in a
 27 Coordinated Action has sued only one or some MDL Defendants in the Coordinated Action, such
 28 Plaintiff would be entitled to receive Generally Applicable Discovery of the Defendant(s) only
 named in such Coordinated Action. (*Id.* at ¶ 11). For example, the State AGs who have only
 sued Meta outside of this MDL would not have access to the other Defendants’ depositions,
 written discovery, and document productions made in the MDL.

1 duplicative discovery only where “necessary to address issues unique to the Coordinated
2 Action”); *In re: Zimmer*, MDL No. 2859, No. 1:18-md-2859, Dkt. No. 74 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 14,
3 2019) (“Joint Coordination Order”).¹⁰

4 In contrast to Defendants, Plaintiffs have shared no such precedent for their proposed
5 order, and their proposal continues to lack necessary substantive provisions facilitating
6 coordination that are standard features of these types of orders. Plaintiffs’ proposal would
7 obligate Defendants to make all discovery available to all plaintiffs (both in and outside the
8 MDL), while simultaneously allowing the non-MDL Plaintiffs to pursue even more discovery
9 outside the MDL without any restrictions whatsoever.

10 For instance, MDL leadership counsel, some of whom also represent plaintiffs in the
11 JCCP, could circumvent Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30’s time limits on depositions simply
12 by re-noticing depositions of the same witnesses in the JCCP and covering purported “non-
13 duplicative” topics.¹¹ Plaintiffs’ proposal would even allow non-MDL plaintiffs (including those
14 represented by MDL leadership counsel) to circumvent MDL discovery rulings in different
15 forums—an inefficient, unfairly prejudicial result, and the precise result coordination orders are
16 intended to avoid. *See In re: Zimmer*, MDL No. 2859, No. 1:18-md-2859, Dkt. No. 74, at 2
17 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 14, 2019) (“Joint Coordination Order”) (finding that coordination of discovery
18 “will further the just and efficient disposition of each proceeding” and “prevent duplication of
19 discovery and undue burden on courts, parties, and nonparties, and produce substantial savings in
20 judicial resources.”).

21 Plaintiffs’ assurances that they have successfully coordinated discovery among themselves
22 – while discovery was stayed and none was taken – are insufficient to forestall an order that has

23 ¹⁰ Contrary to Plaintiffs’ suggestion, the coordination order in *Zimmer* was utilized in related
24 proceedings. Less than two months after entry of the coordination order in the MDL, the parties
25 had agreed to coordination in four out of the seventeen related state-court actions and were
optimistic that it would be entered in at least five others. Dkt. #105.

26 ¹¹ Plaintiffs purport to speak on behalf of Judge Kuhl in stating that Defendants’ proposal would
27 not have “the support of the JCCP court.” In so doing, they misrepresent the JCCP Court’s
28 “tentative” remarks at a case management conference, before she expressly invited briefing from
the parties that has not yet occurred. *See* May 3 JCCP Tr. (ECF #303 Ex. A), at 8:2–8 (“My
view, without conducting [] separate research for this case, is that I don’t think California law
allows the identity of a non-designated expert to be required to be disclosed to a party opponent.
So depending on what is done in the federal court, this issue will need to be briefed here.”).

1 become routine in litigations with parallel MDL and state court proceedings.

2 * * *

3 For all of these reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Court enter Defendants'
4 proposed Coordination Order.

5 **III. Additional Productions**

6 Since the issuance of Discovery Order No. 1 (ECF 125), the Meta and TikTok Defendants
7 made additional productions in response to various state investigations.¹² Plaintiffs requested that
8 Defendants update their prior productions made in this litigation with the additional material
9 produced in connection with the state investigations. *See* Joint Statement, at § 5 (ECF 417)
10 (outlining Plaintiffs' request). Both the Meta and TikTok Defendants have agreed to supplement
11 their prior productions of documents in accordance with Discovery Order No. 1.

12 **IV. CSAM Order**

13 Pursuant to the Court's Case Management Order No. 6 (ECF 451), the Parties filed a
14 Proposed Order Governing Preservation of CSAM ("Proposed CSAM Preservation Order") on
15 December 1, 2023 for evaluation and entry by Magistrate Judge Peter H. Kang, and which
16 remains pending. *See* ECF 461. The Proposed CSAM Preservation Order is identical to the
17 version entered by the Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl on July 31, 2023 in the JCCP.

18 Concurrent with that submission, the Meta Defendants filed an Administrative Motion to
19 File Under Seal an unredacted version of the Proposed CSAM Preservation Order (ECF 462), and
20 an Omnibus Sealing Stipulation reflecting a stipulation of the Meta Defendants and Plaintiffs to
21 file the unredacted version under seal (ECF 463).¹³

22 **V. Plaintiff Fact Sheet and Implementation Order**

23 The Parties agree that the Plaintiff Fact Sheet and applicable Appendices and
24 Authorizations that were negotiated and entered in the JCCP for the personal injury matters
25 should be implemented in the MDL. The Parties also agree that the related User Account
26 Identification Form and User Account Confirmation and Consent Form should be entered in the
27

28 ¹² The YouTube and Snap Defendants have not made any additional productions.

¹³ Judge Kuhl granted an identical sealing request by the Meta Defendants in the JCCP.

MDL in substantially the same form as entered in the JCCP. The latter set of forms provide a process by which (1) Plaintiffs will provide User Account Preservation Forms containing identifying information necessary for Defendants to identify and preserve a Plaintiff's user accounts; (2) Defendants will inform each Plaintiff-user of user accounts that the Defendant has reason to believe are or were registered to the Plaintiff based on the information provided by each Plaintiff in the Preservation Form and Defendant's reasonable investigation; (3) Plaintiffs will confirm which of these accounts belong to but are currently inaccessible to them, and provide written consent to disclosure of information associated with those confirmed but inaccessible accounts; and (4) for each confirmed but inaccessible account, Defendants will provide a download of the data from that account substantially similar to that available using the public tools provided by each Defendant. The Parties expect all of these forms to be finalized in the JCCP imminently and thereafter expect to propose their implementation in the MDL.

VI. School Districts' Short Form Complaint and Implementation Order Schedule

The Parties have agreed to the following schedule with respect to the School Districts' short form complaint and implementation order subject to the Court's approval:

Date	Event
December 18, 2023	Plaintiffs file their Master Complaint
December 21, 2023	Plaintiffs provide Defendants with a proposed Short Form Complaint ("SFC") and SFC Implementation Order ("SFC Order")
January 9, 2024	Parties file a joint proposed SFC Order and SFC, or submit letter briefs no longer than 5 pages double-spaced with their respective positions on disputed issues
January 16, 2024	[Assumed date of entry of SFC Order]
January 30, 2024 (or 14 days after entry of SFC Order, whichever is later)	Plaintiffs with complaints filed by the date of the SFC Order file SFCs
February 5, 2024	Defendants file Motion to Dismiss
March 4, 2024	Plaintiffs file opposition to Motion to Dismiss

Date	Event
March 25, 2024	Defendants file reply brief

VII. Amended Personal Injury Master Complaint as to Allegations Against Meta

Plaintiffs propose to amend the existing Master Complaint to add a single new paragraph incorporating by reference certain of the newly unsealed paragraphs of the State Attorneys General's Complaint against Meta, which Plaintiffs have identified to Meta. Meta consents to the amendment as proposed. The States do not object to Plaintiffs' proposed amendment of the Master Complaint.

VIII. Defendants' Proposal for an Order Prioritizing Resolution of General Causation

Defendants' and Plaintiffs' Position:

Defendants intend to propose that the Court enter at the January 2024 CMC an order that prioritizes general causation for earlier resolution. Plaintiffs intend to oppose this proposal. Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed, subject to the Court's guidance, to address this issue in simultaneous letter briefing due January 15, 2024, so that it may be addressed at the January CMC.

States' Position:

The States were not involved in the agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendants, and they reserve the right to respond to Plaintiffs' and Defendants' simultaneous letter briefing, to the extent that briefing may implicate the States' claims.

IX. Update to the Court on Florida's Role With Respect to the States

Florida is participating with the 33 states in the State AG leadership structure as a State steering committee member and is coordinating with the states on all matters relating to pretrial proceedings in this action.

1 DATED: December 6, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lexi J. Hazam

LEXI J. HAZAM

**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN,
LLP**

275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000

lhazam@lchb.com

CHRISTOPHER A. SEEGER

CHRISTOPHER L. AYERS

SEEGER WEISS, LLP

55 CHALLENGER ROAD, 6TH FLOOR

RIDGEFIELD PARK, NJ 07660

Telephone: 973-639-9100

Facsimile: 973-679-8656

cseeger@seegerweiss.com

cayers@seegerweiss.com

PREVIN WARREN

MOTLEY RICE LLC

401 9th Street NW Suite 630

Washington DC 20004

T: 202-386-9610

pwarren@motleyrice.com

Co-Lead Counsel

JENNIE LEE ANDERSON

ANDRUS ANDERSON, LLP

155 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 900

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

Telephone: 415-986-1400

jennie@andrusanderson.com

Liaison Counsel

JOSEPH G. VANZANDT

BEASLEY ALLEN CROW METHVIN

PORTIS & MILES, P.C.

234 COMMERCE STREET

MONTGOMERY, AL 36103

Telephone: 334-269-2343

joseph.vanzandt@beasleyallen.com

EMILY C. JEFFCOTT

MORGAN & MORGAN

220 W. GARDEN STREET, 9TH FLOOR

PENSACOLA, FL 32502

Telephone: 850-316-9100

ejeffcott@forthepeople.com

1 RON AUSTIN
2 **RON AUSTIN LAW**
3 400 Manhattan Blvd.
4 Harvey LA, 70058
5 Telephone: (504) 227-8100
6 raustin@ronaustinlaw.com

7 MATTHEW BERGMAN
8 GLENN DRAPER
9 **SOCIAL MEDIA VICTIMS LAW CENTER**
10 821 SECOND AVENUE, SUITE 2100
11 SEATTLE, WA 98104
12 Telephone: 206-741-4862
13 matt@socialmediavictims.org
14 glenn@socialmediavictims.org

15 JAMES J. BILSBORROW
16 **WEITZ & LUXENBERG, PC**
17 700 BROADWAY
18 NEW YORK, NY 10003
19 Telephone: 212-558-5500
20 Facsimile: 212-344-5461
21 jbilsborrow@weitzlux.com

22 PAIGE BOLDT
23 **WATTS GUERRA LLP**
24 4 Dominion Drive, Bldg. 3, Suite 100
25 San Antonio, TX 78257
26 T: 210-448-0500
27 PBoldt@WattsGuerra.com

28 THOMAS P. CARTMELL
29 **WAGSTAFF & CARTMELL LLP**
30 4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
31 Kansas City, MO 64112
32 T: 816-701 1100
33 tcartmell@wcllp.com

34 JAYNE CONROY
35 **SIMMONS HANLY CONROY, LLC**
36 112 MADISON AVE, 7TH FLOOR
37 NEW YORK, NY 10016
38 Telephone: 917-882-5522
39 jconroy@simmonsfirm.com

40 CARRIE GOLDBERG
41 **C.A. GOLDBERG, PLLC**
42 16 Court St.
43 Brooklyn, NY 11241
44 T: (646) 666-8908
45 carrie@cagoldberglaw.com

1 KIRK GOZA
2 **GOZA & HONNOLD, LLC**
3 9500 Nall Avenue, Suite 400
4 Overland Park, KS 66207
5 T: 913-451-3433
6 kgoza@gohonlaw.com

7 SIN-TINY MARY LIU
8 **AYLSTOCK WITKIN KREIS & OVERHOLTZ,**
9 **PLLC**
10 17 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
11 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
12 Telephone: 510-698-9566
13 mliu@awkolaw.com

14 ANDRE MURA
15 **GIBBS LAW GROUP, LLP**
16 1111 BROADWAY, SUITE 2100
17 OAKLAND, CA 94607
18 Telephone: 510-350-9717
19 amm@classlawgroup.com

20 EMMIE PAULOS
21 **LEVIN PAPANTONIO RAFFERTY**
22 316 SOUTH BAYLEN STREET, SUITE 600
23 PENSACOLA, FL 32502
24 Telephone: 850-435-7107
25 epaulos@levinlaw.com

26 ROLAND TELLIS
27 DAVID FERNANDES
28 **BARON & BUDD, P.C.**
15910 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1600
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (818) 839-2333
Facsimile: (818) 986-9698
rtellis@baronbudd.com
dfernandes@baronbudd.com

ALEXANDRA WALSH
WALSH LAW
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 500
Washington D.C. 20036
T: 202-780-3014
awalsh@alexwalshlaw.com

MICHAEL M. WEINKOWITZ
LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN, LLP
510 WALNUT STREET
SUITE 500
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106
Telephone: 215-592-1500
mweinkowitz@lfsbalw.com

DIANDRA “FU” DEBROSSE ZIMMERMANN
DICELLO LEVITT
505 20th St North
Suite 1500
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Telephone: 205.855.5700
fu@dicellolevitt.com

ROBERT H. KLONOFF
ROBERT KLONOFF, LLC
2425 SW 76TH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97225
Telephone: 503-702-0218
klonoff@usa.net

HILLARY NAPPI
HACH & ROSE LLP
112 Madison Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, New York 10016
Tel: 212.213.8311
hnappi@hrsclaw.com

ANTHONY K. BRUSTER
BRUSTER PLLC
680 N. Carroll Ave., Suite 110
Southlake, TX 76092
(817) 601-9564
akbruster@brusterpllc.com

FRANCOIS M. BLAUDEAU, MD JD FACHE FCLM
**SOUTHERN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL AND
LEGAL AFFAIRS**
2762 B M Montgomery Street, Suite 101
Homewood, Alabama 35209
T: 205.564.2741
francois@southernmedlaw.com

JAMES MARSH
MARSH LAW FIRM PLLC
31 HUDSON YARDS, 11TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10001-2170
Telephone: 212-372-3030
jamesmarsh@marshlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PHILIP J. WEISER

Attorney General
State of Colorado

/s/ Bianca E. Miyata

Bianca E. Miyata, CO Reg. No. 42012,

pro hac vice

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Lauren M. Dickey, CO Reg. No. 45773

First Assistant Attorney General

Megan Paris Rundlet, CO Reg. No. 27474

Senior Assistant Solicitor General

Elizabeth Orem, CO Reg. No. 58309

Assistant Attorney General

Colorado Department of Law

Ralph L. Carr Judicial Center

Consumer Protection Section

1300 Broadway, 7th Floor Denver, CO

80203

Phone: (720) 508-6651

bianca.miyata@coag.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Colorado, ex rel. Philip J.
Weiser, Attorney General*

ROB BONTA

Attorney General State of
California

/s/ Bernard Eskandari

Nick A. Akers (CA SBN 211222)

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Bernard Eskandari (SBN 244395)

Supervising Deputy Attorney General

Megan O'Neill (CA SBN 343535)

Joshua Olszewski-Jubelirer

(CA SBN 336428)

Marissa Roy (CA SBN 318773)

Deputy Attorneys General

California Department of Justice Office of
the Attorney General

455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000

San Francisco, CA 94102-7004

Phone: (415) 510-4400

Fax: (415) 703-5480

Bernard.Eskandari@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Plaintiff the People of the State of
California*

DANIEL J. CAMERON

Attorney General Commonwealth of
Kentucky

/s/ J. Christian Lewis

J. Christian Lewis (KY Bar No. 87109),

Pro hac vice

Philip Heleringer (KY Bar No. 96748),

Pro hac vice

Gregory B. Ladd (KY Bar No. 95886),

Pro hac vice

Zachary Richards (KY Bar No. 99209),

Pro hac vice

Assistant Attorneys General

1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200

Frankfort, KY 40601

CHRISTIAN.LEWIS@KY.GOV

PHILIP.HELERINGER@KY.GOV

GREG.LADD@KY.GOV

ZACH.RICHARDS@KY.GOV

Phone: (502) 696-5300

Fax: (502) 564-2698

*Attorneys for Plaintiff the
Commonwealth of Kentucky*

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

By: /s/ Phyllis A. Jones

Phyllis A. Jones, *pro hac vice*

Paul W. Schmidt, *pro hac vice*

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One City Center

850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001-4956

Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000

Facsimile: + 1 (202) 662-6291

Email: pajones@cov.com

*Attorney for Defendants Meta Platforms, Inc. f/k/a
Facebook, Inc.; Facebook Holdings, LLC; Facebook
Operations, LLC; Facebook Payments, Inc.; Facebook
Technologies, LLC; Instagram, LLC; Siculus, Inc.; and
Mark Elliot Zuckerberg*

FAEGRE DRINKER LLP

By: /s/ Andrea Roberts Pierson

Andrea Roberts Pierson, *pro hac vice*

Amy Fiterman, *pro hac vice*

FAEGRE DRINKER LLP

300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2500

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Telephone: + 1 (317) 237-0300

Facsimile: + 1 (317) 237-1000

Email: andrea.pierson@faegredrinker.com

Email: amy.fiterman@faegredrinker.com

GEOFFREY DRAKE, *pro hac vice*

David Mattern, *pro hac vice*

KING & SPALDING LLP

1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600

Atlanta, GA 30309

Tel.: 404-572-4600

Email: gdrake@kslaw.com

Email: dmattern@kslaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants TikTok Inc. and ByteDance Inc.

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSEN LLP

By: /s/ Jonathan H. Blavin

Jonathan H. Blavin, SBN 230269

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

560 Mission Street, 27th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94105-3089

Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

Email: jonathan.blavin@mto.com

Rose L. Ehler (SBN 29652)

Victoria A. Degtyareva (SBN 284199)

Laura M. Lopez, (SBN 313450)

Ariel T. Teshuva (SBN 324238)

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

350 South Grand Avenue, 50th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071-3426

Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

Email: rose.ehler@mto.com

Email: victoria.degtyareva@mto.com

Email: Ariel.Teshuva@mto.com

1 Lauren A. Bell (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
2 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
3 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW St.,
4 Suite 500 E
5 Washington, D.C. 20001-5369
6 Telephone: (202) 220-1100
7 Facsimile: (202) 220-2300
8 Email: lauren.bell@mto.com

Attorneys for Defendant Snap Inc.

7 **WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**
8 Professional Corporation

9 By: /s/ Brian M. Willen

10 Brian M. Willen
11 **WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**
12 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
13 New York, New York 10019
14 Telephone: (212) 999-5800
15 Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
16 Email: bwillen@wsgr.com

14 Lauren Gallo White
15 Samantha A. Machock
16 **WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**
17 One Market Plaza, Spear Tower, Suite 3300
18 San Francisco, CA 94105
19 Telephone: (415) 947-2000
20 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
21 Email: lwhite@wsgr.com
22 Email: smachock@wsgr.com

19 Christopher Chiou
20 **WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI**
21 633 West Fifth Street
22 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2048
23 Telephone: (323) 210-2900
24 Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
25 Email: cchiou@wsgr.com

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC, Google LLC,
and Alphabet Inc.*

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

By: /s/ Joseph G. Petrosinelli

Joseph G. Petrosinelli

jpetrosinelli@wc.com

Ashley W. Hardin

ahardin@wc.com

680 Maine Avenue, SW

Washington, DC 20024

Telephone.: 202-434-5000

Fax: 202-434-5029

*Attorneys for Defendants YouTube, LLC, Google LLC,
and Alphabet Inc.*

ATTESTATION

I, Lexi J. Hzam, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 5-1, that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory hereto.

DATED: December 6, 2023

/s/ Lexi J. Hazam

LEXI J. HAZAM

**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP**

275 BATTERY STREET, 29TH FLOOR

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3339

Telephone: 415-956-1000

lhazam@lchb.com